

Discussion Draft of the Fourth Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature

(See also BZN 52: 228–233, 294–302)

The following are amongst the comments which have been received. Further comments are invited; they should be sent as soon as possible to the Executive Secretary of the Commission. All comments received by 31 May 1996 will be fully considered by the Code Editorial Committee, whether or not they have been published in the *Bulletin*.

(1) W.D.L. Ride (Chairman, Editorial Committee)

Department of Geology, The Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra, A.C.T. 2600, Australia

Article 11b in the discussion draft was prepared by the Editorial Committee to meet the objective of facilitating the introduction of names into the zoological literature by ensuring that every new name (no matter how obscurely or inaccessibly published) is made known to zoologists through the widest and most generally available medium, as well as in its original published work. This would reduce the likelihood of the subsequent discovery of overlooked names and displacement by them of synonyms that had been widely publicized from their initial publication.

Considering that zoologists would be unlikely to agree to a proposal that to become available every new name must be 'registered' with a central authority (as occurs in microbiology and is proposed for botany), with both availability and date of precedence determined by the act of registration, the Editorial Committee proposed for discussion that, while precedence would continue to be determined from the date of publication of the original work, to be available a new name must be recorded as such in *Zoological Record* within five years of its initial publication.

Authors are urged to assume responsibility for ensuring that the journal or monograph in which their new name is published is a work that is scanned by *Zoological Record* (proposed Recommendation 11A); the support of other zoologists using as yet unrecorded names is also envisaged (Recommendations 11B and 11C).

Comments on the draft (e.g. Crosskey, BZN 52: 229–232) have drawn attention to the difficulty presented by the period of uncertainty or 'provisional availability' of new names resulting from this proposal. There have also been objections to *Zoological Record* being used in this way on grounds of its inaccessibility to some authors.

An alternative to making listing in *Zoological Record* a condition of availability has been proposed to the Editorial Committee, namely that listing should affect only the relative precedence of new names, leaving their availability unaffected.

By affecting validity only, such a provision would continue to support the principle that very obscure and unnoticed names should not be introduced retrospectively to displace names that have become used widely (even in a short time), but would not remove from authors the right to propose and make available names in whatever vehicle of publication they choose. It would maintain the continued availability of overlooked names to be used as valid when they did not threaten names in use.

The proposed use of *Zoological Record* would be maintained as the best means of notifying publication of new names. As well as being published on paper, *Zoological Record* is accessible electronically and on compact disk; this is of especial value to those outside major institutions. Its use on international electronic networks will increase steadily and, with the already agreed participation of its publishers, it will be easily possible for zoologists to determine free of charge whether a name has been recorded or not, or whether a work is scanned by *Zoological Record* (see Rosenberg, BZN 52: 300).

As an example of the way in which a shift of the proposal to one that affected validity rather than the availability of a name could work, if only one of two available synonyms had been recorded within five years by *Zoological Record*, that name would have precedence over the other (which would remain available for use as a valid name when not regarded as synonymous with the recorded name). If neither name had been recorded, the normal rules for determining validity would apply.

Both advantages and disadvantages can be foreseen.

The Editorial Committee invites comment.

(2) Walter J. Bock

*Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, New York
10027-7004, U.S.A.*

I should like first to make four general comments on the draft. (a) I consider that no rules in the Code should rely on the subjective judgments of zoologists, and that the need to refer cases to the Commission should be avoided wherever possible. (b) I urge strongly that a statement be inserted early in the Code that the name of the author and the date of publication are integral parts of the scientific name of any taxon. This is quite fundamental: for example, *Procellaria* Linnaeus, 1766 is not the same as *Procellaria* Linnaeus, 1758. (c) All the efforts of the Commission to conserve names are negated by the lack of any appropriate provision in the Code (cf. Article 78f). I know that the 1958 International Congress of Zoology failed to ratify the earlier rules and the original purpose of the Official Lists, but this does not prevent the Commission from formulating adequate rules; this must be done in the present revision of the Code. This matter and the proposed Lists of Available Names in particular taxonomic groups are so important that they should not be immersed in Articles 77 and 78, which deal with the powers and duties of the Commission; they should have Articles of their own. I would recommend strongly that names on the Official Lists should have precedence over other names, as many zoologists already believe to be the case; if not, then a clear statement must be made as to the purpose of the Lists. (d) The Editorial Committee have evidently decided that the numbering of Articles in the new Code should be exactly the same as in the current edition. While this is useful in principle, it is my strong feeling that the result is that material is put together into Articles in a confused way and that some material that should be placed prominently very early in the Code only appears much later, simply in order to preserve the numbering system. I urge that the primary concern should be the proper position of material in order to make the Code clearer to users.

Some specific points are as follows (I have supplied a considerable number of other details to the Editorial Committee). *Article 1b(3)*: the expression 'hybrids as such' is